## **REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 10-12 are pending in this Application. Claims 11 and 12 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delamarche et al (J. Am. Chem Soc. 2002, 124, 3834-3835).

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to contain the limitation <u>"characterized in</u> that the spreading is accomplished <u>without immersion in a liquid</u> with the stamp and the article is placed in a reduced pressure atmosphere."

The Examiner is stating that Delamarche does not teach the limitations of Claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, Delamarche is silent in regards to the atmosphere of the stamping process and the Examiner is stating that Delamarche is implying the use of normal air atmosphere. Furthermore, Delamarche teaches that ethanol is used in the stamping process. Therefore, Applicants would not have been motivated to use the process of Delamarche nor would they be reasonably expected to look to Delamarche to solve the problem of providing for a method with improved controllability wherein the amount of spreading is controlled by the contact between the stamp surface and the article surface and the stamp and the article are placed in a reduced pressure atmosphere, without immersion in a liquid. Therefore Claims 1 and 2 are not rendered obvious by Delamarche. Claims 4-7 which depend therefrom are also not rendered obvious by Delamarche.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delamarche as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Geissler et al (Langmuir, 2002, 18, 2374-2377) and Xia et al (Angew. Chem. Int. Ed 1998, 37, 550-575).

Claim 10 incorporates the limitations of Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Delamarche, and therefore Claim 10 which incorporates the limitations of Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Delamarche alone or in combination with Geissler and Xia.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws the objection of claim 10, rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 10 and finds the Application in condition for allowance.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eric Bram at (914) 333-9635.

Respectfully submitted,

Lina Genovesi

Reg, No. 35,154

Attorney for Applicants

24 Clover Lane

Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Phone: (609) 462-4337 Fax: (609) 688-0126